REMARKS

Status of Claims

The Office Action mailed July 27, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-28 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 4-5, 10, 13-14, 19, 22-23, and 28 have amended and no claims have been cancelled or added. Therefore, claims 1-28 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6-11, 15-20, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,571,245 to Huang et al (hereafter "Huang"). Claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of U.S. patent 5,925,103 to Magallanes et al. (hereafter "Magallanes"). Claims 4, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of U.S. patent 6,512,526 to McGlothlin et al. (hereafter "McGlothlin"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 recite, *inter alia*, rendering a custom view based on a stored user context in which (1) an activity sequence is defined by a user as a collection of viewlets from different applications in which (a) each viewlet defines a coherent set of operations performed by that application, and (b) _each_ application is an ordered set of a plurality of viewlets. See paragraph 33 in the specification for support for this recited feature. Therefore, the pending independent claims require that each activity sequence that is defined comprise portions of two different applications (i.e., two viewlets from two applications respectively). Furthermore, each of these independent claims recite that the (2) custom view rendered is based on the user context which stores a sequence of viewlets in the activity sequence and also stores other information that _enable the viewlets together to perform a defined task_. See, for example, paragraphs 36 and 48 in the specification for support for this specification where a particular sequence of the viewlets enables performance of a defined task. These recited features are not disclosed or suggested by any of the applied references or their reasonable combination.

Specifically, the Office Action relies on Huang for disclosing these claimed features. With respect to feature (2) recited above, please note that Huang only teaches that a virtual desktop may be provided in a virtual computing environment so that a user sees the same desktop and access the same applications, files, and amenities independent of the particular computer system on which the access is gained. See col. 5, lines 25-29 of Huang. Nowhere does Huang teach that a user context also stores a sequence of viewlets (which are *portions* of applications that perform a coherent set of operations) together with other information (files or preferred setup, for instance) that enable the selected viewlets together to perform a defined task. Therefore, this feature recited in the pending independent claims is <u>not</u> disclosed or suggested by Huang.

With respect to the feature (1) discussed above, the cited portions of Huang as well is complete disclosure only discloses a customizable desktop in which complete applications or other objects may be selected by a user. See col. 14, lines 21-24 of Huang which states that "[e]ach desktop object represents <u>an application</u>, a file, a folder, a document...." (emphasis added). Therefore, nowhere does Huang teach the claimed customized arrangement of viewlets (which are defined in the claims to be <u>portions of an application</u>) from different applications. One skilled in the art to which the claimed invention pertains would recognize that the word "application" as used in the claims has a clear meaning to those skilled in the art and <u>files, folders, icons, etc by themselves are not considered to a part of an application (i.e., a viewlet)</u>. Rather, icons represent user interfaces to access an application while the files and folders, etc. represent data which are read into or written out from an application. Therefore, the Office Action's assertion "that the representation of an application (by itself) is simply a viewlet" is contrary to the definition of viewlet in the claims as a coherent set of <u>operations</u> *performed by* <u>an application</u> (and not simply a *representation* of the application as alleged in the Office Action).

Since these deficiencies in Huang are <u>not</u> cured by any of the other applied references, the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the pending independent claims.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional reasons for their patentability when considered as a whole.

For example, dependent claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 22 and 23 recite that the activity sequence is defined based on a role associated with a user, wherein the role associated with a user specifies membership in a group of users that perform similar functions. This recited feature is supported in the specification at least at paragraph 39 and is consistent with the use of this term to those skilled in the art in the fields of access control and software architecture to which this application also pertains. As described, in paragraph 39, this element requires that a role characteristic of a user shared with a group (for example, the salesman role) is used to define the activity sequence in the user context. In sharp contrast, the cited portion of the McGlothlin reference teaches that simply that a user profile is maintained for each user. See col. 7, lines 1-5 of McGlothlin. This is of course the opposite of the claimed feature in which an activity sequence of a user is defined based on a role associated with that user so that the activity sequence does not have to be defined individually. Accordingly, this claimed feature is also not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art and provides an additional reason for the patentability of these claims. In this context, the Office Action's assertion that this feature was not recited in the claims incorrectly interprets the claimed terms from the perspective of a layman since this definition should have been clear to one skilled in the art related to the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. An early notice of the same is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview or examiner's amendment would advance the prosecution of the present application.

> **Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 26, 2005   By _Aaron C. Chatterjee_

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP   William T. Ellis
Customer Number: 22428   Registration No. 26,874
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399   Aaron C. Chatterjee
                                                  Registration No. 41,398

                                                  Attorneys for Applicants

-12-